

Berkeley  
Thur., Jan 26,  
Group I

Mr. Nyland: So from now on, all announcements can go on the tape. I have an announcement. It is better to talk about what we're going to do. We're certain about tomorrow and a little half way about Sunday. We didn't settle about Sunday evening and Monday -- Monday. So, we talk a little bit about you remember last time when we -- the first meeting -- and then we said "why not a picnic?" You remember -- that I think was in reference to Saturday. This Saturday I have to go to Palo Alto to see Bill (Kunn ??) Wiederhole - What was that? He was there last night. Did you talk to him?

Elton Hay: No, no, he just said good night and left.

Mr. Nyland: He came up and shook hands very warmly - He is a nice man. So we'll see. We talk again on Saturday if he is any further interested. Do you think he might?

Elton: I really don't know.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah -- So anyhow there will go Saturday because Saturday morning I will want to work. I think Saturday evening will be free. Because Leslie will have been here then . . . maybe much too busy. Friday - tomorrow - music - 8:00 - movements here? -- 6:30 to 7:30, 8 to 10 music. Sunday - picnic, if it's good weather --

Mt. Tamalpais O.K.

Dick: I think the forecast is calling for rain right now.

Mr. Nyland: Ahh, you're a pessimist! . . . If it is raining we'll have to change our plans.

Steve Joseph: I suspect, Mr. Nyland, that even if it is sunny on that day that you're going to find a great deal of mud.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I think you're probably right. Maybe it's not a good place. Maybe, who knows a better place?

Linda Adams: Beaches aren't muddy.

Mr. Nyland: We'll go to the beach then. Who will be organizer for that kind of a thing? Because you know, if we go and we have to do something, what will we do?

Who has any musical instruments? Carryable, I mean.

Doug: I have something.

Mr. Nyland: What?

Doug: Well, I have a guitar.

Mr. Nyland: Good. Who has, who has something else? Who can play? Who can entertain? Who can knit? Who can bring some stuff that we can work on? You know if we don't do that, then we'll sit and look at each other's face and hope that somebody will talk and maybe I'll be forced to talk, amybe it would be very good for me not to talk at all. But if we can just sit and do something. I can bring some, some correspondence I have to answer. You know . . things that never get done. It would be a good opportunity if the weather is any good. Yeah?

Linda Adams: Mr. Nyland, last year when Eve was here she said that the women in New York were making wall hangings, I guess for the music room and they were being woven on thin boxes with nails stuck along the upper and lower edges and the measurements were 11 x 15. Umm. . .

Mr. Nyland: No, that went into a rug. And the rug is now finished and it is in the library in New York.

Linda: What if we all made looms and came and started braids and sent them to New York? Weaving is good at the beach you know . . all that seaweed around and things, good patterns. I should think.

Mr. Nyland: I should think it is fine, if you have something to work for, like the wall hangings in the music room. I think Eve invented that one.

John Booker: The last time we were at the beach we, we cleaned it up. Dug a big pit and buried the things.

Mr. Nyland: Good, in any event we have to do something. You know. We are not going there to sit. I have no particular literature with me that we could read. Otherwise we would perhaps be able to read something from the third series. But I didn't figure on that because I thought that we may be able to do that when I come back . . So who is organizing for it? . . Two, at least two people.

Linda: I'll handle the Palo Alto.

Mr. Nyland: Good . . . John?

John Booker: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Food, it has to be prepared. Could I leave it to you and Linda to talk it over and everybody who is asked has to, has to accept. Don't try to get out of it. Either you go then take the responsibility even if you don't like it or if you have to break something for it, you do it. Try to put it on that kind of a basis, because if you don't you will always find excuses. And sometimes it is necessary to break this habitual way of "I'm sorry, I have no time", or this or that comes in between or maybe and so forth. Maybe, perhaps, tomorrow - you'll remember that the few words that Gurdjieff thought were necessary for the English language. Yes, No, Maybe, Perhaps, Tomorrow. You remember Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, what was his name? (Discussion) Yes, always something to get rich on. So . . . If John or Linda asks you, you know, the answer is yes.

You noticed probably that in the open meetings, the first meeting, here, was mostly devoted to making statements about the conditions of man as he is and the terrible situation we are sometimes in, without immediately giving any particular kind of a solution to it. It might have left a certain impression that here we are, where now we can clean up things and make an ideal world. For that reason, it was necessary yesterday to make it very much more difficult. And it might have disappointed some people in listening to it that after all trying to become conscious is not so easy and it would require some kind of a payment. So you have to take the two meetings together and they belong together. And it is only to indicate that whenever you talk about work, don't make it too easy. And whenever you have any particular new people, that although you may be convinced that it would be worthwhile for them and that with all your heart, you believe that it would be useful, you have to be very careful to talk that you must know that those are the kind of people that really would respond to the possibility of wanting to work and not simply

that they happen to be looking around a little bit for something that might be, might be nice. Your judgment about that is of course left entirely to yourself and it may come with the best of intentions that you hope that some of your friends will respond to this and that you think they belong. And you will find out they don't and in most cases, even you misjudged them and you don't know enough about them and all you know is that they are friends and many times that is only on the periphery. You don't know how much they would be willing to pay for it and how lazy they are although sometimes they may talk very interestingly. I think later on you can take those two tapes and listen to it again, to refresh your memory.

So now we have tonight, Music, tomorrow. Saturday then, nothing. Sunday, good weather and the beach. Sunday evening open, huh. We can go to church. Monday, what was Monday, oh yeah, organ . . Yeah, imagine. Trinity Church. Unitarian? No, Unitarian. We were there weren't we, huh, last time. From 3 to 6. Anyone you think who wants to come is quite welcome. Monday evening, what will we do? Group I or everybody? Because we are going to talk about what I think you ought to do during the weeks that I am not here. And maybe, it will be, no, not harsh, but indicating more or less exactly what I think. So group I and II, everybody. Well, what is, what is your pleasure?

Doug: I think that if you are going to outline things to come, I think that enough people in group II have been with it long enough that it would be both groups.

Mr. Nyland: What do you think?

Ron C. laughs

Mr. Nyland: I think we indicated more or less that group II could come, because you know, music, I talk a little bit, but that is not really . . On Saturday Sunday nothing unless we go to . . So we won't talk on Sunday, you know, so Monday . .

Margie: I think it would be good if both groups were here. Sort of a good sendoff. Us a good sendoff.

Mr. Nyland: Give it to me . . the sendoff.

Margie: That's on Tuesday.

Mr. Nyland: All right, both groups. That is also Palo Alto. Can they make it? See what you dan do. All right, for everybody then on Monday. Now, question about LSD. Should we talk about it now or on Monday.

Group response: Monday

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, . . . It belongs really to Group I.

Dick: Let's talk about it now.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Dick: Let's talk about it now.

Mr. Nyland: No, group I will be there on Monday also, you know. Is that tapes 632 A and B still here?

Ron: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Who has listened to it?

Male asks? Is this the Millbrook tape?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, the Millbrook tape. Who has had questions about LSD? From new people who ask, in relation to work.

Male asks: Yes, we have had questions.

Mr. Nyland: I think it's, it's an urgent question although I think that the effects of LSD in particular publicity isaa little bit worn off. I think that there are still remnants and I think that it is necessary to talk about it from the stand-point of Gurdjieff.

Ron: The difficulty has always been for me to attempt to somehow balance out logically the overwhelming effects of the actual experience that people have had while under the influence of LSD. Because, the experience is, is, something that they have had and logic certainly isn't going to be able to provide something to balance that.

Mr. Nyland: No but since they don't know what they are doing and they don't know the after-effect, maybe, that the experience may be the, worthwhile for the experience

as such, it may be the payment is too much. I think they are playing with fire and if you can illustrate that why they are playing with fire, then maybe they think twice. I think that alcohol is also very nice as an experience. But it surely means that after a little while you can get effected by it. The claims that are made about LSD doesn't mean that they are true and usually it isn't. So I don't think much . . We can talk about it on Monday if you like. So, what do we talk about tonight? What is there that you think that we, we ought to discuss?

Pat Booker: Mr. Nyland, do you have any comments on the book by Raphael LeForte?

Mr. Nyland: Oh yeah, that's right. Didn't I promise that I would say something about it? Well, Teachers of Gurdjieff, it is a very interesting title and anyone who is interested of course in Gurdjieff would like to know where he got it. I think the book, to say it in one word, is a fraud. I would almost say that it is based on suspicion and perhaps on assumption because I don't know the exact facts. But there are too many statements in it that are not, not correct for one thing, and another is that is is really dangerous because some of the things being not true and by implication and given in such a way that it might provide an opportunity for those who now are interested in Sufi-ism that it would be a justification for them that they have been with Gurdjieff before that now they have the perfect right not to consider him any further because he died. In my opinion, the whole thing is a put up job by Bennett. Not only is the style by Bennett but the publisher is Bennett. And the Sufi center is right near Coom <sup>be</sup> Springs or almost in the back yard of Mr. Raphael, huh, "Le Foo", I call him "Le Foo". I think it is a much better name. I tell you why I think it. Bennett, as you know, was a person who was interested in the 1920's simply in Gurdjieff as a personality when he came to Constantinople on his way from Russia to finally ending up in France. And at that time, Bennett, by his own words, was a "dashing young officer" in the British Intelligence Service. He was at that time maintained by someone, who later married him, who was 20 years older and had some money, and in general Bennett was of course quite young and

being in the intelligence service, happened to meet Gurdjieff and talked a little bit with him. And of course Gurdjieff probably talked with him. Since that time, Bennett became interested in Ouspensky whom he met in Constantinople and went to England where he was at Blye and stayed with Ouspensky for some years, I don't know how long. I have no particular indication that Bennett went to Fountain Bleau during the early years but it is quite possible he went once or so. But, in any event, he didn't bother about Gurdjieff at all anymore for more than 20 years. After a little while, probably in 19 . . no, probably in 1928 or so, he asked Ouspensky could he start his own group in Coombe Springs and then he formed an Institute of Historical Contemporary Science and Psychology and so forth. It had a beautiful imposing title, and started his own little ShacherMacher Work~~ers~~shop. So with that he brought several people together and did talk about Gurdjieff I don't know if they mention Gurdjieff's name but it was very much 'ala' Ouspensky and then it became very soon 'ala' Bennett. What he did during these years I really don't know very much. He tried to keep a job that he had as a director of a research firm in coal, in the coal industries, and he had been active in that I think and then up to the war when he was fired by them because he spent too much of his time on esoteric knowledge.

Well, that in itself is not very important. The main thing is that all of a sudden in 1948, at Christmas, Bennett appeared in New York and wanted to see Gurdjieff which he did, and stuck around for another couple of weeks until he had to go back to England and Gurdjieff went a little later. Then during the summer, since Bennett had started several groups in England and a few in some other countries, because they had to travel for the firm, he brought several of those people to Gurdjieff and during the summer of '49 before Gurdjieff died several of his so-called pupils were with Gurdjieff or at least saw him in Paris. And when he died, when Gurdjieff died, Bennett became a little bit of an, maybe, authority and was asked by Madame Saltzmann to give a series of lectures in New York. Four of them were given, which were not very bad. They were quite all right. Bennett is a good speaker. He has a good mind, he is quite clear. He interprets a little bit, but that isn't

so bad. So gradually it became more and more Bennett doing this kind of thing and perhaps less and less Gurdjieff. First, when Madame Saltzmann was trying to organize also a combination of all groups, from Paris as well as in London, and when we set up the Gurdjieff Foundation in New York, Bennett stayed out of it. He wanted to stay on his own and he gradually separated more and more and I don't know again how much he mentioned Gurdjieff but in any event it was not very co-operative in any way whatsoever. He became interested in writing different books "Dramatic Universe" for instance, or the Book "The Crisis in Human Affairs" and then after a couple of years apparently this didn't seem to work out very well, and Bennett became interested in Subud. I think he didn't know very much about what it was to work but he wrote a book called "Witness" which also talks about this early period, and the implications also of that book is that he had known Gurdjieff ever since he met him in 1920 until his death. . which of course, everybody who knows a little bit about the history, knows that it is a lie. So the implications are constantly there so that whenever Bennett would talk about Gurdjieff that it would be with a certain amount of authority. Now this is to say, that after a couple of years in which he had many lectures and many mimeograph notes which were sent all over the world, Subud appeared on the scene. Bennett was advised of the existence of Subud by someone who was in Cyprus who had heard about this Subud as a so-called super Guru in Java and upon Bennett's instigation Subud was asked (Pakh Subud is his name) was asked, was asked to come to Europe and to come to England. Well, this whole Subud affair, as you probably know, started to spread with all kinds of organizations everywhere in the rest of the world and Pakh Subud was almost, I would say, carried from one place to the other and I think he enjoyed it a great deal. Subud started in New York, we had some groups there, different people from the Foundation went over to Subud and we made a rule that anyone who went to Subud couldn't come back. But Bennett advised the different people that whenever Subud's name was mentioned, he was the follower of the person who had been designated, as it

were, or indicated by Gurdjieff, because Gurdjieff had made a statement to him, Bennett, implying again that he was the only one, that there would be after his death, someone from the East who would come and carry on. Well, Subut was the man who did it. And therefore Bennett was justified to turn all his so-called Gurdjieff groups over to Subut. He had a terrible time doing that, and a lot of people didn't like it and after sometime left the Subut movement and interesting enough, Bennett himself left. Why he left, I don't know. He probably got out of it what he liked, a lot of admiration and Pakh Subut finally was "packed" off too. Packed back to Java, I think, where he is. They used All and Everything for literature and until Pakh Subut wrote his own little book which is quite infantile, and what happens at the present time is a lalahan as you probably know which was given for life. Pretty soon it had to be given once a year, pretty soon instead, once a week then twice a week, etc., etc., It is a stupid affair. But it is good sometimes for old ladies.

So after he left, Bennett didn't like the Subut movement anymore, I think. The glory was gone, and he became interested in Roman Catholicism. He went to a cloister in Northern France, tryed to get in there and convince the priest of Subut and he came out being convinced of becoming a Roman Catholic himself. But anyhow, I think, in the meantime, his wife died. His wife was 20 years older, when . . . I don't want to gossip about that particular thing because it is not very nice. With Subut also, there were difficulties regarding, oh, there was a lot of publicity as you probably remember, there was also at least one death on account of this Subut treatment. So it was not very savory. But anyhow the Roman Catholicism didn't last too long, because a little later Bennett went to India and became interested in Baba. Not Meher Baba. This kind of Baba Guru lived to be 137 years old and Bennett afterwards published a book on him, what was it, "Testament of . . ." something, I forgot the name. Very interesting book and quite nicely written. And the statements that are made did not come originally from Bennett but came from the

man who was the main disciple of this Baba. But in any event, after that, I think Bennett started to publish some literature from the Institute and also wrote another book, more or less on the psychological development of J.G. Bennett, also in the same kind of a vein, you probably will say when you open the book, you shut it because it stinks a little bit. So after this, Bennett was looking for something else. And then he became interested in Sufi remembering that at the time when he was in Constantinople he had met some. I think he made a special trip again and met some of the Sufi people and among other people he met Idries Shah, the person who you probably know has written a book on Sufi. Well, the upshot of that was that he invited Shah to come to Coombe Springs and there was Coombe Springs ready to become a Sufi center and he even donated Coombe Springs to Idries so that he could do with it what he pleased. And again now I speak by rumor, I understand that Shah sold Coombe Springs. Now there is nothing there and I don't know where Bennett is and how things are going on. But now I think that this little book was published for the purpose of getting more and more aspirants to come to the Sufi, and it is written as you know by an Englishman who travels a little bit and has some money, and visits the different Sufi teachers and then the last one tells him to go back to England and there by golly right in his back yard is this Sufi center, which apparently he never knew before. The visits to the different teachers, the different Sufi masters, I think are quite interesting because everyone sends him to someone else until finally he is going back to England. Maybe they didn't want him. But in any event, whatever knowledge he gets from the different Sufi people is that they know everything, everyone of them, knows everything about Gurdjieff. They must have read All and Everything in all languages in which it was published. They must have had knowledge of The Remarkable Man, knowledge of the Third Series. They must have had knowledge of what Gurdjieff had done at Prieure, also what he did probably in England or in New York, and everything up to his death. This by people, by Sufi teachers at the time when Gurdjieff was a young boy and probably

went around a little bit here and there in order to learn some carpentry or whatever it was as a trade. The whole thing is so idiotic and so idiotically put together and although there may be a few statements that come from Sufi, because after all Sufi is not a science or mysticism that you can forget about so easily. There are definitely statements in it that are quite, quite good and useful. The whole temper of all the things that have been discussed is not so convincing and it is my opinion something that Bennett has wanted to write, to spread certain things around because one of the statements is, and may be made by more than one of the masters, is that Gurdjieff having died, there is no further influence. He has lived his life and that the purpose of his life has finished. This, you see, would be a justification for Bennett to leave whatever he had gotten from Gurdjieff, and since Gurdjieff now had died, that he had to look for someone else. That justified him in looking for Subut and it justifies him now to look for Idries Shah and the Sufis have foretold that afterall it is not worthwhile anymore from those who really know, that Gurdjieff was also under the influence and under orders of some higher force which then adds a little bit of an "in" to the group perhaps consisting of Sufis who tell now that Gurdjieff has finished his task and there is nothing to expect anymore and that therefore anyone who is now following Gurdjieff really doesn't know what they are talking about.

I think the little book creates a very bad impression and is wrong of course from the standpoint of what we happen to know. But it is also dangerous for, for those people who don't know anything at all. And the title Teachers of Gurdjieff of course is attractive to anyone who is interested in Gurdjieff. I think it is doing a little bit of damage. And maybe it's good that it does that because those who believe in it and are now deviating and no further interested in Gurdjieff, I think that it is just as well that they are not interested. Sooner or later, maybe, they would lose their interest anyhow. Is that enough about the little book? Throw it in the corner. It is not worth it. I thought it was worth it and I bought eight

copies from London, specially sent, thinking that I would distribute them. But then I read it again for a second time. The reference to a little Persian Garden of Truth in it, if you remember, is very nice. There is no copy in existence that you can buy; it is not in England, it is not in India, I've written for it. And finally I found a copy of it in the public library in New York and we are copying it, because in that little book the statement is made that everything as far as Gurdjieff is concerned was right there in that little Persian book. Well, it isn't. It is exactly the same as Rumi, you know Rumi, the Persian mystic, and many of the things in the statements again are very lovely and flowery and also sometimes to the point but to make a claim that everything is in that little book is quite idiotic.

While we're on the subject; there was another man who died about three months ago. His name was Boris Moravia. He was a professor, a Russian, at the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He wrote a book called "Gnosis", published in three volumes, same kind of an idea as Gurdjieff had, also calling them exoteric, misoteric, and esoteric of which, which were published in French a couple of years ago. Unfortunately the man died. I would have liked to see him because I think he was a very interesting man, although the gossip had it that this particular man was not worthwhile being visited by none as far as I know of the Paris group. I talked to \_\_\_\_\_ about him who didn't know very much about it either and only that he claimed that whatever was published was exactly like Ouspensky. I got a hold of the book because it was translated and is at the present time existing in two volumes. The first two in English as manuscript. It was sent to me because the published was interested to know what I thought of it and of course I looked through it and studied it. It is not at all Ouspensky. It is much more. It is much better. The many diagrams that are in it, are really excellent. The substance is of course extremely dull. It is the reading, it is very difficult to read. And only anyone who is scientifically interested in Gnosis, in particular science from that time and the correlation of different ideas, I think would have a desire to

continue. I got the third one in French and I looked through that but I don't want to trust myself well enough to know exactly what is what and I'm still waiting for the manuscript of the third volume in English which I think is all we'll need. In general, I think the book is worthwhile but I don't think that there will be a publisher who is interested enough to publish it. I think it would be too bad. It would be excellent material for anyone who is interested in the real theories that underlie it and again there is gossip about this man because he more or less claims that Gurdjieff got -- his information from Boris' uncle . . so and that somehow or other Gurdjieff stole it, maybe when the uncle wasn't looking, and that he got information surely, maybe from Mt. Anthos (?) he must have known Ouspensky and must have known about these kinds of things, surely he did know in some way or other Gurdjieff or perhaps he had access to different sources which are also related to Gurdjieff. Totally, as far as literature on Gurdjieff, or the ideas of objectivity or the diagrams that are in existence, I think that the book is very, very valuable and the reason I mention it is because it is available in French. And if you really want to study it, I think it would be very much worthwhile. I think that at the present time there are many things that are being published, including the latest of Katy Hume, which will give certain aspects of Gurdjieff. I've said that several times, because each person is affected of course in some way or other by Gurdjieff and then thinking that that is all, all being so enamoured that they have been effected, start to write a book and sometimes maybe to help Gurdjieff, like Margaret Anderson claims that that was the reason for her to write about the unknown of Gurdjieff, and Kate Hume who likes to use it as an autobiography for her own little glorification. Here and there, there are nuggets of gold in it and are very much worthwhile. And you have to dig for it but you have to remember that there is always a personal element that comes in there and sometimes spoils it and sometimes quite a bit. If you take Journal of a Pupil by Stanley Nott I think that it is also spoiled because Stanley

introduces many things that really don't belong to him at all which were gathered and collected by the people during the time Orage was in New York who made notes and Stanley somehow or other got hold of them, published them in the way he thought they were to be published and indicating more or less that they were his and they are not. A little information of course is in the notes, there were several things that were taken during that time, even Kate Hume is not free from that, she made notes during that time, and someone else made notes. I have the notes of those particular meetings that Kate Hume describes in '35 and '36 and of course there were thirteen years for those notes but to make a whole book and then simply say that that is Gurdjieff of course is nonsense. The unknowable of Gurdjieff is probably unknowable as far as Margaret Anderson is concerned. DeHartman's book is also the same kind of a thing. It is good for that particular period, not further. And Madame DeHartman is honest enough to admit that it was 25 years when she didn't see Gurdjieff and that was exactly the time that Gurdjieff, you might say, cashed in, or really was the man who was at that time writing and producing certain things and that the last years of Gurdjieff's life were of course quite different from the years when he was searching and almost 20 years was the head, I'm sure he was the head of the searches, searches of the truth.

Who, by the way, has read Glimpses of Truth? Ouspensky makes a statement in In Search about reading a certain manuscript that was written purported to be written by one of the pupils of Gurdjieff at the time that he was in Moscow. Afterwards it was certainly that among us as Glimpses of Truth that anyone reflects it as . . who, who has read it, anyone of you? I will send it to you. It would be worthwhile to read it among all of you. It is of course the visit of Ouspensky to Gurdjieff when he met him for the first time sitting on an ottoman, a divan, and talking until the early hours in the morning. You don't recall. I will send it.

The other books. Now, what else is there?

Peter? Not so bad, not so good. First part is better, second part is bad. And who else? It always is this personal element that creeps in and always with

it the indication that they are the only ones who Gurdjieff really talked to. He talked to the others, but to them he gave something very, very special. I think it is a common occurrence that that does happen. I don't think you can blame people for it, because they have a perfect right, exactly like Bennett, to think that Gurdjieff was the one who told only him that the man would come from the East. But of course that story has gone around among all of us at the time and each one of us can claim that he was the special one chosen by Gurdjieff to have that secret. I think it is also difficult to get away from that what one gets from Gurdjieff and then assumes that no one else gets. Everybody gets, got, something from him and when you read it that it can only give just a little aspect and from that standpoint interest. Sometimes, for instance, hat what Stanley writes, he had no right to publish. There were lectures of Gurdjieff that were not to be published. They belong to the groups as we have them in New York and some who were in Paris, some of the notes we translated at the time, and they were of concern only to us, to those who attended such, such groups with Gurdjieff. And if anything had to be published afterwards, it should have been done with the consent of those who can, could judge about it. But then the rumor exists also that now the third series will be published. It is still a rumor. I do not know in how far, or how far it has gone. If it does, if it will be published, I think it will be a terrible mistake and it is without any question not in agreement with what Gurdjieff wanted. He said so. But at those who might publish it, are the responsible people who have access to the third series and who, then, have consented and even the statement was made in the publication of the second series, which I think is quite wrong. You see what happens to this kind of material. At what extent can one really trust that for the sake of publicity, for the sake of not knowing what to do next, that something new has to be added instead of exhausting that what exists now to the fullest extent and if really such people are so anxious about the publication of new material, those are exactly the ones who

don't work at all. Sometime ago in New York, I made a statement that as far as work was concerned, as we try to talk about it in New York, and of which meetings you get tapes here, that there are at the present time of that kind of information on tapes of meetings, enough, if you have one tape each week, there is more than enough for twenty years. I would almost say for the rest of your life. It is material of course of a certain esoteric nature, having to do with practical work, certain examples and tasks that I, but I am quite certain that if you really want to, to work that there is enough there for, say cut it in half, for the next ten years. It is not that I feel that I can now stop because I have done my duty, I think I have done it. I really wouldn't feel badly at all if I stopped at the present time, and simply said "go to it, you have enough". You are on your own. Of course I don't do it. Because I have another aim and still think that it is necessary to, to do as much as possible in reaching as many people as possible because the drop outs of course, it is a high percentage. This you will find out also of the people who did come here on Tuesday and those who came to Palo Alto yesterday. You will find many people, particularly after last time, that, who get a little bit scared and won't come back. Remember that I mentioned that when you do bring new people, you have the responsibility for them. I think you have to go after them and find out who brought who and the list is available, should be made available of everybody who came and that you have to check if any of your friends came and that it is necessary to find out why they do come or not come or whatever it is that their reaction was towards the meeting as a whole, not me. I'm not interested in that. I'm interested in what they understood of work and to what extent did they work. Let's say helped to derive some form, impetus, for wanting to do something. If that is worthwhile and then, you have quite a lot of people, you will have work on your hands. That is you have a responsibility that you have to discharge and it means working together it means also, like we talked at the first meeting, I was here, about the necessity of the exactness of definitions.

And the use of certain words so that there is no question about it, what is the meaning and that you all then start to use that same kind of a word because Gurdjieff uses it. It is much more necessary for the individual study and working together I've said something about that, maybe I'll say a little bit more on Monday, but here we are as an intimate group, call it esoteric if you like, this is the main stage of that what is now in Berkeley and San Francisco and Palo Alto. And from you will be expected certain help to go to any other kind of a group that might be formed. So don't make a mistake about it. Portland, I think can be managed from Seattle, and perhaps from us in New York. But if we start in Big Sur, which I hope we will, when I come back, by the way, we didn't hear from Santa Cruz anymore . .

Ron: Excuse me, I heard today. He's at Berkeley

Mr. Nyland: Several months?

Ron: Living

Mr. Nyland: Oh, living.

Ron: Living, he moved up here.

Mr. Nyland: Ah, so much the better. Good. Whatever it is, there were some people interested in Santa Cruz and they meet. That might work out although they became also interested in Baba and . . There are still people around who skirt, you might say on the periphery of work. I think they could be gotten, or perhaps gotten back, or that with a united effort on your part and understanding your responsibilities to make such attempts. You have to be much more organized for that and much more work together and much more help Ron to carry the burden. I know I talk about that and I will all the time talk about it and it's not that I'm critical, it's only that I want to remind you that these are the things that have to be done; I mean you really want to help in that way, it would be a very great help to you; I still call it the movement as a whole because I have definitely the feeling that as far as Gurdjieff is concerned, it is only the exactness that will count. And if you want to have something that is the exact statement, it is the

Oragean version by Daly King. It's better than Ousppansky. Take that as your guide. It should be made available again for all of you so you can have it. Know this, Daly's wife at the time is interested in republishing and she wanted to do it with me and I said no because it would require certain revisions and I think it would be a little silly to do that and use the material that Daly has, particularly since I have the intention of writing something which I didn't want to publish, and I still do, but which has to do, of course with resumes here and there from that what we have talked about in meetings and which I am now working on. It is a project which I all the time talk about without producing anything more called Firefly. It will be there; don't worry. We'll work on it. It is almost in the preliminary stages so that it can be printed. I have difficulty getting a good printing press because we want to do it ourselves. But that will be available. It will be available for us; not for anyone else. It will also contain information of an esoteric knowledge. It will not contain information about Gurdjieff or my relation with him. I think other people have talked enough about it and I'll let it go at that. The acknowledgement, as you know, is entirely Gurdjieff. It has nothing to do with my brain. It has to do with the ideas as they came and as Orage at the time clarified, and thanks to him, and also with Daly writing a little bit about it, also quite useful, together with various notes we made from time to time, and naturally when Gurdjieff happened to come to New York, or the time that we spent in Paris or Fountain Bleau with him. All of that accumulated and gave certain data and of course interest. And as I tried to draw on that when I tried to be exact in putting it down so that it can be useful, of course I hope I will, I hope I will not make a mistake.

Now, what else do we talk about. What else is . . . on your mind?

Charles: Mr. Nyland, what preparations might one make prior to going to be at night if one wants to waken to themselves upon waking in the morning?

Mr. Nyland: Once there was a question about a similar thing. I believe I answered it. Was it Don Adams? It was among you. We talked about the differences between just falling asleep and the difference, just waking up in the morning. I said then, at that time that the best time to try to work is when one wakes up in the morning because during the sleep, if it's sleep, the three centers are disconnected or at least in a good restful sleep they will be disconnected during the early parts of the morning when one still is a little sleepy and as soon as you open your eyes and you are not as yet engaged in ordinary observations which are visual, or audible or that the sense organs are not functioning as yet, there is a period of almost an in between state in which the three centers are separated and that then "I" could be aroused practically at the same time as one opens one's physical eyes; that then at that time it is very good to try to wake up to one's self, that then at that time when one becomes engaged in ordinary activity which does not involve any of the three centers and only physically and to some extent the intellect directing one's walk but no particular feeling about anything, that then one could maintain for one's self a state of being awake for quite some time. The reason being simply that when one is awake that then under the influence of "I", the three centers start to function separately from each other and that the first possibility of an observation simply means that I intentionally bring about a relationship between my intellect as it is in the beginning and that what is the manifestation of my physical body so that impartiality and simultaneity means that I want to eliminate any influence of any one of the centers like feeling or intellect on that what is taking place when my body simply is behaving or moving. And that the intention on the part of my intellect to become aware simply means that there is a separation between that what is the rest of my personality which can go on the way it is but that the "I" as the beginning of an intellectual body starts now to function in the way an intellect really should function, so that when it could grow up as a body that then the "I" in that kind of "full-grown-ness" could have a relationship

as a separate center now being in a state of being separated from the others and that at the same time while "I" being, while I am observant, of that what takes place with the physical body, I will not allow any of my feelings or even emotions to take hold of my physical body for the expression of that what is called an emotional state. So that, when I become objective or conscious, the result will be that the three centers, possibly full grown into three bodies, will now be able, under the influence of the intellect which has become a positive factor, joined together in what then would be called harmonious combination of the three functioning then as an harmonious entity on the level of a being of existence of a different kind in a higher form - or - not nature - form of greatness in which consciousness is paramount and of the greatest importance for one, as far as the maintenance of the level of their being is concerned. If that is the aim, and if that takes place in the direction of consciousness and of a conscious state and of course with the formation of will and if "I", for some reason or other in ordinary life, unconsciously and waking up out of physical sleep, I can discover then that my centers are already disconnected, this time by nature, that I should use that particular opportunity in order to wake up, because half of the work, you might say, already has been done. And all I need at that time is the determination on the part of myself that I've set something in my mind going, wishing to be aware of that what exists and at the same time, that what exists is already free from all different influences so that my struggle for impartiality, the struggle for simultaneity, has been greatly reduced. Compare to that state as you go to bed there is of course also a moment, you might call it twilight between that what is daylight and that what is night and it is also going in a certain way, not too slow and you're not too tired, not too fast so that you're completely oblivious but it is a little period in which you start to lose ordinary consciousness. And it is at that time that one is in a state of lability, a state of certain equilibrium in which gradually that what is bondage and which is in your consciousness as you know it unconsciously, gradually

disappears and it goes over into a state in which you give yourself to the necessities of your body. At that time one becomes looser and looser from the feeling of one's self and you don't want to retain that as a maintainance for yourself but you rely then on the ability of the body being left by itself as it is without any particular wish even to think or to feel that one, as it were, at such a time trusts it will wake up at the proper time when it has rested. So, during this little period during which you lose your consciousness and go over into a physical sleep, there is an opportunity that the "I" is not asleep and it can keep in existence and can keep observing that what is taking place of the body itself and that whatever the body now experiences is an ordinary unconscious process. And it remains unconscious going over from a waking sleeping state into a sleeping, physical sleeping state, is of course an unconscious process, but it will lead to the possibility during that time that that what is attaching you as far as your physical body is concerned has been greatly reduced and it is then as if there is a certain form of relaxation already taking place in your mind and in your feeling which then, when it is relaxed sufficiently and when it does not require much energy for the maintenance of it that then the "I" still can have the energy, you might say almost, which is available as a result of being saved from not having to go into the unconscious direction. So that particular period is also useful but you run the risk that that what is now used for observing and the maintenance of the "I" can not function really correctly because the three senters are more or less connected because of the events of the day and that what is still in the mind is not so easily put to sleep when one has had many impressions during the day which have been lodged in your memory and your memory will continue for a little while particularly when the physical sleep is not so, so close by, or that perhaps you are a little bit nervous or a little bit worried or a little bit over-tired and then that particular period of time to wake up or to be awake while you are falling asleep is not so conducive. It is much better in the morning, but periods can be used. If it happens now at the end of the day, something takes

place because the little "I" at the beginning of an intellectual body is not subject to the ordinary laws of earth and it is not functioning in accordance with anything that we now know by formulation or description of whatever we experience. The little "I" only exists, and it will exist for us when we feed it, and for the rest it is objective for the rest it is only interested in the existence of its self and no further implication, even, of that. So the question of sleep; the "I" is not tired. The "I" now has been functioning but that was a requirement of its own life and in that way it has not had friction it has had no interference, no particular obstacles because it only starts to function when it has food and it digests it by means of becoming observant and recording facts about the behavior of my body. So the possibility exists that I physically fall asleep but "I" does not fall asleep. It is a very interesting thing because "I" is not bound at that time by time, It is in existence as being and when it once is there you might say very well anchored, rather concentratedly created, when I go to bed with the wish and the knowledge that an "I" can exist and I try at such a time to fall asleep with "I" still observing my sleeping body. There are recordings possible during the time when one is asleep of that what is now body behaving in that way, as a body asleep. It is interesting because the black has gone to one's memory although it is objectively recorded, it is a fact of my body which also can be recorded. It will not last long because the "I" observes best when that what is the object is in movement. When that what only exists and of course the body exists and exists only without movement when the body is asleep, the "I" cannot continue to remain aware of it. Simply, it does not receive energy from a sleeping body.

You might say that "I" in that beginning in this transitory period is running on its own momentum with that what has been given as an intense wish before one falls asleep and then associated records but then after a little while it also stops and then becomes . . let's call it . . hybernated. It remains in existence but it has

no function. However, as soon as the physical body wakes up, then "I" can be present. Immediately when the physical body starts to function in an ordinary sense, there is a possibility of having a wish and the wish immediately will bring the "I" back and then it will help immediately when it is awake, that is, when the wish has been translated into food for the "I" to function, will immediately affect the state of myself, that is my physical body and that, again dependent upon the intensity of the wish before I fall asleep, then when I wake up with that intensity as energy available, the effect on my physical body when it is still in this almost indolent state, a state in which it is not as yet engaged in ordinary life, will place it on a very high level. The high level meaning that it is freer from the ordinary bondage of earth and it is closer to a state of consciousness by itself. And that the little "I" that is responsible for that in doing that, wishing then that body, you might say, to participate in the existence of the life of "I". The reason for that of course is quite obvious, because if the "I" actually exists as a , as a source of life that what could come in close contact and that it is willing when it is already in a state of great relaxation when it wakes up and then because of that, the effect upon that what is, is going into an unconscious state will start at a higher level of being. So the result of course after that will be that it will take more time before it runs down to ordinary existence and that although in ordinary life having been refreshed by physical sleep and it might take, if one gets up at 6 it might take until 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning before that "I" goes back to the average level of existence, but in a case like this it might last until 11 or 12 o'clock.

One can try this; one can really with all the wish in the world go to bed trying to hope to wake up in the morning and if you do you will see there are most startling results possible. It depends on the intensity of the real wish and also it depends on the relaxation which is necessary as far as your mind is concerned, because the "I" where it operates, where it becomes really an objective faculty is a very delicate thing and the least little bit of disturbance upon the part of our mechanicality will

affect the way, how it can function. And sometimes, even, if it is fed, it can not function because of . . I always compare it to the noise that is around . , it prevents it from living. But in a quiet state, during the night and when the mind is not as yet functioning, then it has a chance, and a much better chance and the time that is involved in that, that is the actual time spent in translating of that which is now an awakening of "I" with a wish to be awake and to remain awake is extremely short. I would almost say that particular time is timeless. In other words it has dealings with objectivity and objectivity for us is also a form of timelessness compared to "Mother Earth". In reality it is not timeless, it only appears it, the emotional level and even the soul level have all sort of time levels because they are in such tremendous changed, different kinds we mentioned, that for us it seems much more like infinity than it is in relaity. If I live in it, it becomes finitely real. From the standpoint of earth, it looks like infinity; so that the time that is needed for the translation of the wish into the actuality of being awake is almost instantaneo So you see, these are the advantages for the morning, of course, and for the evening? Try them both. Find out what works best. See if you can derive benefit when you fall asleep.like that, as if a little "I" is watching over you. You remember the little songs of the angels that guarded you: 2 at your feet, 2 at your hands and one remains with you during your sleep. What other questions?

Bill MacDonald: Would you alke about austerity day in reference to once a week?

Mr. Nyland: Austerity has to be prepared for; it is not something that comes easy. Austerity is a sacred day. In austerity I come to myself. I want to do it in order, by means of the way I am then to have a better relationship with that what I consider a higher form of life or at least something that exists for me which can help me to live in ordinary life. So I have to prepare for it in such a way that that what I am I would present to such a possibility . . call it for one moment mystical union

with that what I search for, what I would really try to uncover, that I am in such a state that I am acceptable. I try to do it by the preparation of seeing how would I be and eliminating all the possibilities of the things that might disturb me.. Anything that I can do to eliminate any chance of anyone else calling me up or anything that has to be done, telephones and so forth, preparation of food which I don't want to do on that day, having enough food so that I don't have to run around. That what I want to do as far as activity is concerned is allowed, because it is better to have the body busy instead of sitting. It is not a state of dreaming, it is a state of activity but at a very low rate. So then if I do it once a week, I want to derive from it something that is good for my body and for my mind and my feeling. And that I want to bring then, during that period a certain contact with whatever I am in ordinary life with that what I believe exists within me in my inner life or perhaps what might even be a form of life as represented by magnetic center. Of course, it is obvious that during that time, I don't want to spend too much energy. At the same time I have to keep going because it's very difficult to be, to remain awake to something that is quiet. The efforts that I do make, however, have to be of a little different kind than I usually would apply as a result of my wish to work. Many times when I want to work in life, I can not be open but I can have energy that is available for making that whatever the "I" now has as an impression to make it conscious and that the effort on my part is always mixed a little bit with something that we call concentration or the wish to be intense, even if the wish is for wanting to wake up, something in me is a little bit concentrated or perhaps a little tense. On an austerity day, it's a different kind of process. I want to yield or be open to that what I could receive. For that reason I don't really work in the way I usually would work in life. I simply, you might say, try to be and be open to that what I can receive. It is almost as if I become passive. Although I may be busy with ordinary life working . . I may be walking around, I may even be hammering or doing

some carpenter work or moving back and forth or even sit if I wish to read and walk again, and in general spend my time in that way on activities which do not involve me too much. At the same time what has to be my body and my feeling and my mind has to be open in such a way as if I'm ready to receive something from a higher source. It is then in that particular kind of yielding or yearning or that what I hope for, and sincerely hope for, that that what is my real self comes to the foreground. It is then as if I do not live in the way I usually live and I don't live in my body. The accent on the day of austerity is very definitely on my emotional state. And it is by means of this emotion that I try to reach the level of the contact with that what is higher than I am because emotion has a chance of being lighter than any of that what I now experience as something that belongs to me like physical behavior and even is lighter, interestingly enough, than the thoughts I have. Because the thoughts many times - if I want to think them - are dependent on the rates of vibration of my mind as it is and can not get out of it. For some reason or other the emotions can free, be free from you because they have a different kind of a quality as far as materiality is concerned. So what I do on a day of austerity, and I want to try to realize for myself what I am and what I might become, that is also what I am potentially, and what is in me as far as my ordinary life is concerned serving me or becoming - use the word for it - religious or in contact with that what is a higher force for me. In order to reach that and in order to be sufficiently light, I practice something like trying to unify myself. That is, if whatever I do and happen to think or feel, that what is my personality I try to combine everything of myself in that what I am doing or in that what I'm thinking or feeling. In that way you might say I fuse all the parts of my personality into one, so that that what is emotion now can get hold of something that is complete as an entity and need not be dispersed over the totality of my personality. You see, it is a very interesting concept that I first want to make myself completely one so that there is really, if I could say it, no particular dimension in which then that what exists almost like a point could go direction in the "on" of my emotion - up, and then because of its lightness almost start

to flow - and that they will allow it - to go up because I am yearning for that possibility. So it's in the first place then: open-ness. Second place: fusion. Third place: wish to go, as being attracted.

In the austerity one thinks about not only how I am in ordinary life and doing away with that at what prevents it, but the accent is then on that what I really am. What I am potentially, what I hope God will want me to be, and I also start to think, if I can and if I cannot I want to feel about that what is God: what is for me sanctity what is for me, holiness, what is for me, sacred, what is for me belonging to that what is really essential for me, what is really of the greatest value in myself which you might say I then would like to, to carry as a treasure and offer it if I could meet God, to him, as if I want to give myself - it is that form of dedication. Austerity is really that. I try to do it of course because I don't want to be encumbered by all kind of bondages, so I make it as simple as I can, and the thoughts and the feelings are reduced to a minimum and also my activity and also that what I know tendency and I know of the different feelings there that might interfere and would serve as an obstacle when I want to wake up; I want to, I want to become as naked as I possibly can, spiritually. And I want to be in that kind of a state in which actually that what is emotion can help me to lift me - I say to float - that it will as if I ascent to heaven. And in such a time I will discover the value of myself. But you see it is necessary to prepare. It is not just something that you go into easily like you buy a ticket or come to New York. It is a preparation. It's a thought process before. It's a feeling and having a right attitude for it. And it is also quite definitely a wish that during such a time I wish to have that as an experience because I consider it worthwhile. Then I don't, I don't talk about it. I don't even let it known, you can take the telephone off the hook. If you have a family, it's a little more difficult. You have to find a place where you really can be by yourself and it's better to have half a day of austerity instead of the whole day a little wishy-washy. Separate whatever you can do, whatever obligations

there are on what may be the possibility for yourself to work in that sense. And whatever it is that you can do, that is all. When you cannot do more, don't resent that you can not do more. You will later, I am quite sure. If there is difficulty now, let it pass.

All - right?

More and more - I said it yesterday - the necessity of working. This question of being serious about it. The question of knowing that it is of course not easy. But also the question of knowing that one who has lived a certain length of time in an unconscious state and that much of that has to be dissolved. Not necessarily you're not, ( ) because the roots of "I" are in your personality and they feed on that and "I" will never grow unless it has sap and nourishment from that what is your ordinary life. Your body - it is the earth in which "I" can grow as an intellectual body being erected - you might say on top of the earth. You remember the diagram - the physical body of do to do - soul body of intellect is on top. It is where your head ends - where your life ends. That where the new intellectuality starts what you base now as intellect on that what is the foundation of your body - so that that what grows as it were from your head on further has its roots in the rest of the body which is represented as earth, for the further growth of that what is important of great importance. That what reaches from the earth to heaven. That what is the bridge between man and God. That is "I". That is his intellect, ultimately, when it functions correctly. And then having within itself the possibility of that wish, you might say flowing towards heaven and at the same time the root system of "I" taking care of the anguish of the body and holding it together. When I say this, I simply mean that you have to realize that your life certainly has to furnish the desire for wanting to work. And that you have to be extremely patient to see that there are certain times, only at certain times certain things can be done. And you must know that that is the case for yourself, then you must know that that is the case for everyone. And because of that, this question of tolerance, the question of

patience, the question of non-criticalness, all of that you have to learn in working together and that whenever it happens that you see how you fail and what mistakes you make, if you could be honest enough, if you could make yourself say it to someone that you have been stupid and that you really mean it, maybe then it will help you because with that particular statement you own up to be what you are in the presence of someone else so that they understand, that that is the way you wish to work and the result of your work, it will help someone else whenever you're honest because he will, if he isn't, he will be ashamed and if he is honest, he will help you by reflecting that honesty back to you so that you will feel at home in the presence of such a person.

It is quite important for co-operation among . . . you have to learn that, of course, that it is not easy, and like all work of this kind, it has to be paid for with the truth, that you really wish to do it; but, I would almost say that a day is long, it starts out and the waste is still great. Reduce it, work towards it, pray for it. Prepare for it the previous day, if you can. Use tapes if you wish. If you can, that's what they're for.

How to live; how really to be. How much you wish to be; how much you know you can do. What particular measurement you will employ for the measurement of your consciousness. How can you free yourself from the ordinary measures which are based on, usually false knowledge or in any event many times on the wish only and not on the actual fact. Talk much more among you, among yourselves. Really, talk about work; talk about what you know what you have experienced; what you know is right, on which you can stand. And to tell it simply.

To group attendance - be on time. When you come to your group on Thursday, the open-ness ought to come out of your eyes, not your regular life, you don't bring that. You bring yourself but you bring it with a willingness - almost, I would say joyfully - you have to bring it, hoping, wishing for something that can take place open, so the possibility that it will take place; going home with that, within you; almost I would say closed enough so that you keep it and don't lose it immediately after you leave <sup>Dec 4</sup>  
~~closed~~ talk, talk, talk about ordinary affairs. For one evening a week try to

be that serious, and that what you take stays with you and you digest and you want to keep until you fall asleep and you get home so that there is still something of that kind, of that kind of nature, I call it now, of that kind of food that is still there, that still gives you the taste and it is as if something had entered into you, and at that time has made an impression - sometimes in your mind, sometimes in your heart you know how it is sometimes how certain things keep on singing in you. Sometimes you know this is music, that whenever you might hear something, that affects you, it lives with you - it is in your mind, it is in your heart, it is in your mind with a little melody, it is in your heart with a little light, warmth or perhaps even to some extent a little sentimentality. But it stays there and that is the taste. There is a taste in a meeting - and it is for use but it is for you to prepare in which all of you are cooks and in which all of you now sit down at that particular kind of a dinner and you want to eat from it and take home with it whatever you can and digest it. And even if you may be eating a little over much, all right give it rest. But don't dissipate it immediately as if that what you are drinking after you have had a meal will dilute everything . . it is so silly to drink too much after you have eaten . . You know that because you dilute your youth, your stomach. If you talk, talk, talk; if you let ordinary life take over you dilute what you might have gotten during a meeting and the acquisition of something like food for your inner life and if you allow it, I'd say you're a stupid fool, because then even you shouldn't come to the meetings. When you come, when you are here; be complete. Try to bring that what you are in all its glory; in the way it is, but honest in the way that it is. You present that, with that you talk and you tell about what happened to you, that day, the day before, whatever it is.

I gave a task to Seattle once: that the next week when they would come back, everyone should report what has happened each day and that each day everyone of them, without exception, should write down what efforts they have made during that day for working  
~~so that when they got together a week later, each person could read notes~~

from seven days of that week what they had done: when, how, where; short, but in any event, the events of that what has happened to them regarding the possibility of waking up or making efforts to be awake. It was a very good task. Some did it; not everybody; not in the same way. But, the attempts were made. It was a very good task. Some did it; not everybody; not in the same way. But, the attempts were made. It was very good. I don't want to give it to you because you are too many people. If you want to do it for yourself; do it. If you find out what works for you; you use it. Don't worry about what is the reaction among other people. Don't care about their criticism. Just go on; you wish to work; you want to wake up; any way you wish to wake up, you use whatever that is and whatever means and if it is reality for you, you actually have wakened up. Then you can tell it because you have a right to tell and no one has a right to question you. You will know. You know when you fib. You know when you appear a little bit better than you are. You know when you lie. You know when you are a hypocrite. Sooner or later, your "I" will not allow it anymore and you will really, if you work, with this "I" become master of your self, your physical body, your emotional body, and, of course, master of your soul. The question is always how to become God. How to live. How to be as if God is with you and still to remain a man.

Yes?

Linda Adams: Mr. Nyland, concerning talking about work. It seems that over the past few years, and especially over the past six months - that the more exposure I have to work, the more I see of it and the more time passes that what I would have to talk about in relation to work is not what I accomplish but the obstacles that I meet in myself that keep me from working and it seems like these things would be a personal matter that I would have to deal with myself and get rid of them. I think this is like . .

me.

Nyland: You think it is too difficult to talk about work?

Linda: Well, I don't . . . in a way it seems kind of stupid to talk about it because they are only my own battles and I don't want to feel like group therapy when I come.

Mr. Nyland: Well, it's probably that everybody has the same kind of obstacles. It may go by a different name and it may not always be of the same size. But I think in principle they are the same; and whenever I talk about that as a, a representation for myself of my mechanality or the tendencies or characteristics that I have, traits of character, I stay with certain human framework and I know that everybody lies, everybody has this and that, certain obstacles that they have to overcome regarding the sleepiness of himself. I don't think that it is too private. You see, the privacy comes in that I really don't know what to do in accordance with my conscience but the description of work has to do with the description of consciousness. If it is false for me, making a decision according to my conscience, then I would like to make that myself, so when I report, I don't ask for anyone's opinion. I simply make a statement, "I've tried this". Sometimes you might say, "as you all know, I'm pretty conceited, I always want to have the last word." Simply let it go at that. That's a statement. Some people can agree. Some people can say: "Yes, I'm conceited also". "I tell a lie." What I said Tuesday night. I talked about the variety of different things on the level of existence of particular young people at the present time. Knowing this, you may make it easier on all the rest, you know? It is nothing really to confess that one has all kind of human foibles and to talk about that. But that isn't the question. What will I do now? Or what particular choice should I make. Then my conscience comes in. Many times, I don't want other people to tell me what to do. But I can talk about it. If it is difficult, tell them a story about someone else who you met who told you a certain thing and it's you. But you make it appear as the other. And it is in that case that you can ask advice.

You see what I mean. You don't have to be too serious about that. I think it is a common occurrence that every person knows that it will happen in the best of families. The simpler one is the better it is. The more open one really can be, the

more reason there is for having a language which you understand. The more you hide the more they have to hunt, the more chance there is for mis-interpretation. Don't allow it. When one works, I've said it many times, it is like a research. One puts all the facts on the table. Everybody can look at it, it's so obvious. My relation to God is a different thing. I call it my conscience of course because I don't want to . . . I want to do it myself, I want to try it out for myself. I want to know what is right. I want to . . . almost I would say a solitude a silence. I want to be advised. A group will not give that, it cannot give that. And it is not entitled to come into my private life when my private life is that what determines my personal or professional or even sociological life, and to the extent that I understand the privacy of myself and my relation to that what is a higher level of being, to that extent will I lose part of it, to put it into the different activities and relationships belonging to personal, professional or sociological . . In that way, that what I pour in, it is as if I pour content into words that I speak. It is as if I, when I look, that something comes out with that what is now functioning as my "I" coming out together, perhaps emotion of a certain kind which may be tinted religiously . . . (RUNS OFF TAPE)